

101 E. Wanda,
Garland, Texas
Feb. 15, 1964.

Mr. William J. Alexander,
Assistant District Attorney,
Dallas, Texas.

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Attorney Jonahill said that they would want to know if a prospective juror was prejudiced against Bulleit because of his religion or his association with strippers. Well, there are several things to say about the remark. (1) It's a fact that most non-Evangelical Jews, like Bulleit, were, are lost, and ~~had~~ knowledge of a fact does not prejudice people. Prejudice means, to judge before having the facts. (2) He was not only associated with strippers, but he ran a strip-tease business. (3) It's a fact that such a business is immoral; and knowledge of a fact, like it has already shown, cannot

prejudiced people. (4) A law of God teaches that either you are against rejectors of Christ or you are against acceptors of Christ. Jesus said, "Either you are with me, or you are against me." A non- Evangelical juror is infinitely more apt to make pre-judgments (which is the definition of prejudice) than are Evangelicals.

Mr. Joneshill said, "We intend to examine prospective jurors' Conscious, subconscious, and unconscious thoughts. There is no such a thing as unconscious thought. The concept is self-contradictory. The psychological concept of the unconscious mind is repugnant to the Word of God in the Bible. There is no such a thing as the subconscious; but it more or less essentially different from the Conscious, but is only a lesser degree of Consciousness. Let us what St. Paul was talking about when he said, 'In this earthly life, we oftentimes see through a glass darkly.' The sub-conscious is what we know deep

down in our hearts, or it is what we know "in the back of our heads" (to use a popular expression). Many times, when one fears that God might not have forgiven him of a sin, he has sufficient knowledge in his subconscious mind that God has forgiven him so don't let Jonathan do influence you to think that Bullockstein could have consciously been a sinner, the law and subconsciously a breaker of the law.

I don't need to prove the specific things the 3 psychiatrists have to say about the recent examination of Bullockstein's brain. All I need to prove is that men like Bullockstein are declared to be insane only by means of the modern concept of insanity, which is totally heretical, or repugnant to the word of God in the Bible and that no insanity can possibly exist to fill the Bible. All of the criteria which are used by modern psychiatry are heresies, and it can point out about 100 of them.

Professor Louis L. Jaffe, of Harvard University Law School, made a speech at the University of Texas Law School.

And in this speech he said that it may be that we will have to have a judicial policing of the press, to prevent the press from printing statements which interfere with a fair trial. But see judicial policing of the press must be done according to the standards of the people because this is a government by the people. The people believe in the right to know. This is a government by the people. Nothing in the Constitution is more nearly absolute than is the right to know. The people are the court, last resort, next to Christianity. Next to Christianity, the people are to decide as to whether some news reports interfere with a fair trial. A judicial policing of the press, which is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, would be a major disaster to the people, would create a police dictatorship towards the something like a Police State set up. Of course, judges would have to be involved in the policing of the press.

If John Bell makes a circus out of trials like the Harry Harrod's press types too much with Justice, it would be against the law and the right to put a stop to it, and make by from \$10,000 more valuable than an attorney not making a circus out of a trial.

James C. Hagerty said that the press has been abusing its privilege at times. But the freedom of the press is not a privilege, it is a right. The freedom of expression is more apt to be a privilege than is the freedom of the press. This freedom of right of the press is called the right to know.

Legal experts cannot get by with with policing the press, inspite of what the people think about the matter, so long as the people have the power to impeach legal experts.

Of course, a government by the people, unconditionally is repugnant to the word of God in the Bible. But until Christianity influences our country to cease to have a government by the people, it will continue to control legal experts.

When this country starts letting

experts be the court of last resort, the according to what the word of God in the Bible says about the matter. ~~the experts~~
~~will say about the matter, the experts~~
 will be preachers, and not secular lawyers. But I doubt that the Harvard law professor was advocating this kind of ~~experts~~ ultimate expertise.

Mr. Hagerty said that Dallas police should have barred the press from the police station after the shooting of President Kennedy, ~~on the~~ argument that police spokesman could have come outside and made a report ~~about~~ about the case. But that ~~it~~ would have been ungodly, unconstitutional, and a police-state system. It would have been ungodly, because Jesus said, "Nothing ~~that~~ I say shall not be revealed.... What is said in secrecy will be heralded from the house top." And the Fundamental Christian doctrine of individualism teaches that every individual has the right to know, ~~so~~ since any individual can recognize and expose

singjustice, as well as a billion
people can.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. Cecil Greenham.

P.S. Attorney Nelson, ^{Belli} was asked on
T.V. if he would try to prove Rubenstein
was insane. And Belli answered, "Not in
those words, but we will just enter
a plea of not guilty." But Belli cannot go
by with the ~~cross~~^{cross} of using so-
term which would connote an associa-
tion of sanity with insanity. Because
I know that God won't let him
get by with it at the Court of last
resort, and I am confident that the
Dallas prosecution won't let him
get by with it. There is an infinite
difference between sanity and insanity.
only on a plea of insanity or on the
argument that there

There are only 2 pleas which Belli could
enter at the trial. (1) The plea that there
is a Christian law which is above
the law that Rubenstein committed murder,
and the Christian law would make
Rubenstein not guilty. And (2) The plea of insanity

in light of what I have already said about Psychiatry, psychiatrists are some of the most unqualified

~~psychiatrists are the most unqualified~~
~~superior to, or judges of, a brain~~
~~examination. If the report which~~
~~the Dallas News reporter gave of~~
~~the brain examination had not~~
~~been correct, it is impossible to say~~
~~whether the psychiatrist would~~
~~not have waited until now to say so.~~

Mr. Jonahill also said he would want to know what the prosecution jurors thought about President Kennedy. But if any one assumes that R. T. the president of the U.S. is a good man, unconditionally, he is committing blasphemy or ~~is~~ is advocating the belief in a Godless humanism. Any juror who ^{was} ~~was~~ for Kennedy would be as apt to be prejudiced for Rubinstein as a ^{juror} ~~juror~~ who was against Kennedy would be apt to be against the ~~juror~~.

prejudiced

prejudices against the ~~juror~~ Christians & since all of them would lie about there no longer believe would lie about ~~any~~ against the ~~juror~~ Christians his attitude toward Kennedy, all possible

would consequently be prejudiced for Jack
 against this reason or any good
 Ruthenstein's brother would at least be
 position down to the defense. Some other cause
 than charged me prejudices rather than any body
 reason for being for him, all the gentle
 juries would be prejudiced for
 Ruthenstein. In other words, we
 will resile down to Mr. Ruthenstein
 defense's saying, "The Court must choose
 my prejudices, rather than say I have
 else's prejudices." How impartial a
 jury like that would be!

A woman said she it was an
 ounced on T.V. that Ruthenstein ac-
 cepted Jesus Christ. If that is true
 and the truth is known, then he should
 not have to receive more punishment
 than 2 years in the penitentiary.

If they don't have to give a reason
 for rejecting a prospective witness, they could
 a person to sit in the jury box
 reject any person one, just because he
 says he is a member of the church.
 Say the most evangelical juries were first.

Seeing detective grab the man
 whom the seeing detective grab the
 man the former saw shot dead
 is proof that the defender supplied
 at the trial is the real killer.

C.S.G.